

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/784,174	02/24/2004	Hironobu Saka	019970-011	9282	
21839	7590 08/26/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P			KRAMER, DEVON C		
POST OFFIC	E BOX 1404 IA, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
712272111211	ari, vii 22313 1 10 1		3683		

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<del></del>	<del></del>	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	M
Office Action Summer	10/784,174	SAKA, HIRONOBU	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Devon C Kramer	3683	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addres:	s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tte, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this commur D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	•	•	rits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) $\square$ objected to by the $8$	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	, ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre			
•	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Adion of form P10-13	<i>5</i> 2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer  2. Certified copies of the priority documer  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea  * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	nts have been received.  Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in the control of the control o	on Noed in this National Stag	<b>e</b>
Attachment(s) )  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4\ \[ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc	(DTO 442)	
P) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	te	
) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/10/04.	5) Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)	

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Objections

- 1) Claims 1-5 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - Claim 1 line 13, "the openings" should be -openings--;

Claim 13 line 5, "the closed ends" should be –closed ends--. Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3) Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al (6116384).

In re claims 1, 6 and 13, Matsumoto et al provides a disk brake comprising: a disk rotor (D); a pair of pads (6) with respective back plates (6a); a pressing device (Figure 1) arranged and constructed to press the pads against the disk rotor a shim (figure 2) disposed between the back plate of each pad and the pressing device and defining a space (11d) for storing a grease between the shim and the back plate the shim comprising: a first shim member (11) and a second shim (12) member overlaid with each other and disposed on the side of the back plate and the pressing device, respectively, so that the space is defined between the first shim member and the back plate; and storage regions (11d) defined within the first shim member throughout the

Art Unit: 3683

thickness of the first shim member in order to store and retain the grease (col. 4 lines 1-4); wherein: the storage regions are configured such that the grease substantially entirely covers the openings of the storage regions and is retained within the storage regions by the surface tension of the grease. Please note that Matsumoto et al is silent to the temperature range at which the grease is retained in the spaces.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have grease remain in the spaces by its surface tension at least when the temperature of the grease is within a range of 20 to 200 \*C merely as a design choice depending on the environment of use and the type of grease used. Please note that different greases have different properties and viscosities. If grease were to seep out of the openings in Matsumoto et al it would render the invention inoperable, therefor it is advantageous for the grease used in Matsumoto to have a specific viscosity corresponding to the temperature range of the environment to remain in the opening.

In re claims 2, 7-8, see 11d.

In re claims 3 and 9, Matsumoto et al is silent to the width of the slits.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the slits of Matsumoto with a width within a range of 0.5 to 2.0 mm since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 3683

4) Claims 4-5 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al (6116384) in view of Suzuki et al (5975252).

In re claim 4 and 11, Matsumoto et al lacks the teaching of the storage regions being circular through holes.

Suzuki et al teaches storage regions shaped as circular through holes (31d).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the storage regions of Matsumoto with circular regions as taught by Suzuki et al as a design choice and to provide a shape which retains grease and is easily machined.

In re claims 5 and 12, Matsumoto et al as modified by Suzuki et al is silent to the diameter of the through holes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the storage areas of Matsumoto as modified by Suzuki et al with a diameter within a range of 0.5 to 2.0 mm since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

5) Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al (6116384) in view of Chen et al (6283258).

In re claim 10, Matsumoto et al lacks the teaching of the recesses extending along a substantially radial direction.

Chen et al teaches recesses (37) extending along a substantially radial direction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the recesses of Matsumoto et al to extend in the radial direction merely to retain grease when the rotation of the disk provides a force to the pad.

### Conclusion

- The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gerhardt et al, Biswas, Yano et al, Kawamura, Endo, and Kumamoto et al all provide brake pads with grease retaining structures.
- 7) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devon C Kramer whose telephone number is 703-305-0839. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Lavinder can be reached on 703-308-3421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3683

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dugholoy

DK